

## Supreme Court of Misconsin

#### OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215 P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Telephone (608) 266-1880 TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880 Fax (608) 267-0640 Web Site: www.wicourts.gov J. Denis Moran Director of State Courts

Diane M. Fremgen Clerk of Supreme Court

#### WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

#### December 2015

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of December 2015 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2015.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions involving 22 cases in December. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

<u>De</u>	<u>cember</u>	2015 Term to Date
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	22	32
Attorney disciplinary cases		<del>18</del>
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	13	14
Criminal cases	0	0

#### Petitions for Review

A total of 68 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In December, the Supreme Court disposed of 51 petitions for review, of which 2 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 181 petitions for review pending.

	December 2015	Term to Date
		212
Petitions for Review filed	<u>68</u>	<u>213</u>
Civil cases	27	92
Criminal cases	41	121

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>51</u>	<u>224</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted)	29 (2)	119 (16)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	22 (0)	105 (10)

#### Petitions for Bypass

In December, the Supreme Court received 0 petitions for bypass and disposed of 2 petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has 2 petitions for bypass pending.

	December 2015	Term to Date
Petitions for Bypass filed	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases	0	1
Criminal cases	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted)	1 (1)	3 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	1 (0)	1 (0)

#### Requests for Certification

During December 2015, the Supreme Court received 2 requests for certification and disposed of 1 request for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has 2 request for certification pending.

	December 2015	Term to Date
Requests for Certification filed  Civil cases  Criminal cases	2	4/3 1
Request for Certification dispositions	$\overline{1}$ (1)	2 1 (1) 1 (1)

#### Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 3 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 2 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 1 petition for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original actions were filed. An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in "Opinions Issued by the Court" above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. The Supreme Court currently has 32 regulatory matters and 6 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

December 2015 Term to Date

<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases)	5	20
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	1	10
Other (including Original Actions)	0	2
<u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline	1	2
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	4	12
Other (including Original Actions)	1	4

# DECISIONS BY THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT

#### **OPINIONS ISSUED DURING December 2015**

Docket No.	<u>Title</u>	<b>Date</b>
2003AP3348-D 2004AP2633-D 2007AP2653-D 2011AP584-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Michael D. Mandelman Reinstatement Denied Per Curiam <sup>1</sup> Concur: A.W. Bradley, J. R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	12/08/2015
2014AP2086-D	OLR v. Richard W. Voss License Suspension Per Curiam	12/08/2015
2014AP482-D	OLR v. Gerald P. Boyle License Suspension Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J.	12/23/2015
2014AP2487-D	OLR v. Eric L. Crandall Public Reprimand Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J., joined by A.W. Bradley, J.	12/23/2015
2015AP1340-D	OLR v. Jeffrey John Aleman License Suspension Per Curiam Dissent: Abrahamson, J. R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	12/23/2015
2015AP1422-D	OLR v. Zachary T. Krogman License Suspension Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J., joined by A.W. Bradley, J.	12/23/2015

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Per Curiam" means "by the Court." Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

### **CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES**

Docket No.	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2014AP296-OA 2014AP417-W thru 2014AP421-W 2013AP2504-W thru 2013AP2508-W	Two Unnamed Petitioners v. Gregory A. Peterson; Francis D. Schmitz v. Honorable Gregory A. Peterson; Three Unnamed Petitioners v. Gregory A. Peterson. Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Stay Denied, Mandate Clarified Per Curiam Concur/Dissent: Abrahamson J. A.W. Bradley, R.G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate. Crooks, J. passed away while these motions were pending and prior to their final resolution by the court.	12/02/2015
2014AP1938	New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond Decision to accept petition to bypass vacated and remanded to the court of appeals. Per Curiam Concur: Abrahamson, J., joined by A.W. Bradley, J. R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	12/18/2015
2013AP1488	State of Wisconsin Department of Justice v. State of Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development Decision of the court of appeals affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, J.  Prosser, J. and R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	12/30/2015